

1 SCOTTLYNN J HUBBARD IV, SBN 212970  
2 KHUSHPREET R. MEHTON, SBN 276827  
3 **DISABLED ADVOCACY GROUP, APLC**  
4 12 Williamsburg Lane  
5 Chico, CA 95926  
6 Telephone: (530) 895-3252  
7 Facsimile: (530) 894-8244  
8 Email: USDCCentral@HubsLaw.com

9 Attorneys for Plaintiff

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
11 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

12  
13 MARTIN VOGEL,

14 Plaintiff,

15 vs.

16  
17 NORMS RESTAURANTS, LLC dba  
18 NORM'S RESTAURANT; SPIRIT  
19 MASTER FUNDING VIII, LLC,  
20 Defendants.

) No.

) **Plaintiff's Complaint**

I. SUMMARY

1. This is a civil rights action by plaintiff Martin Vogel (referred to hereinafter as “Vogel”) for discrimination at the building, structure, facility, complex, property, land, development, and/or surrounding business complex known as:

Norm's Restaurant  
17844 Lakewood Boulevard  
Bellflower, CA 90706  
(referred to hereinafter as “the Restaurant”)

2. Vogel seeks damages, injunctive and declaratory relief, attorney fees and costs pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. §§ 12101 et seq.) and related California statutes against: Norms Restaurants, LLC dba Norm's Restaurant; and, Spirit Master Funding VIII, LLC (hereinafter collectively referred to as “Norm's Restaurant”).

II. JURISDICTION

3. This Court has original jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343 for ADA claims.

4. Supplemental jurisdiction for claims brought under parallel California law—arising from the same nucleus of operative facts—is predicated on 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

5. Vogel’s claims are authorized by 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.

III. VENUE

6. All actions complained of herein take place within the jurisdiction of the United States District Court, Central District of California, and venue is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), (c).

IV. PARTIES

7. Norm’s Restaurant owns, operates, and/or leases the Restaurant, and consists of a person (or persons), firm, and/or corporation.



- 1 • There is no signage at the strike side of the men's restroom door that
- 2 would indicate to Vogel that the facility is intended to be accessible
- 3 to him;
- 4 • The water closet stall door is not self-closing, thus making it difficult
- 5 for Vogel to shut;
- 6 • The toilet tissue dispenser is mounted too high, thus making it difficult
- 7 for Vogel to reach and use;
- 8 • The toilet tissue dispenser is mounted too far from the front of the
- 9 water closet, thus making it difficult for Vogel to reach and use; and,
- 10 • The pipes beneath the lavatories are incompletely wrapped, thus
- 11 causing Vogel to risk burning his legs when washing his hands.

12 These barriers prevented Vogel from enjoying full and equal access.

13 11. Vogel was also deterred from visiting the Restaurant because he knew  
14 that the Restaurant's goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, and  
15 accommodations were unavailable to physically disabled patrons (such as  
16 himself). He continues to be deterred from visiting the Restaurant because of the  
17 future threats of injury created by these barriers.

18 12. Vogel also encountered barriers at the Restaurant, which violate state  
19 and federal law, but were unrelated to his disability. Nothing within this complaint,  
20 however, should be construed as an allegation that Vogel is seeking to remove  
21 barriers unrelated to his disability.

22 13. Norm's Restaurant knew that these elements and areas of the  
23 Restaurant were inaccessible, violate state and federal law, and interfere with (or  
24 deny) access to the physically disabled. Moreover, Norm's Restaurant has the  
25 financial resources to remove these barriers from the Restaurant (without much  
26 difficulty or expense), and make the Restaurant accessible to the physically  
27 disabled. To date, however, Norm's Restaurant refuses to either remove those  
28 barriers or seek an unreasonable hardship exemption to excuse non-compliance.



1 available through alternative methods is also specifically prohibited if these  
2 methods are readily achievable. Id. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(v).

3 20. Here, Vogel alleges that Norm's Restaurant can easily remove the  
4 architectural barriers at Restaurant without much difficulty or expense, and that  
5 Norm's Restaurant violated the ADA by failing to remove those barriers, when it  
6 was readily achievable to do so.

7 21. In the alternative, if it was not “readily achievable” for Norm's  
8 Restaurant to remove the Restaurant’s barriers, then Norm's Restaurant violated  
9 the ADA by failing to make the required services available through alternative  
10 methods, which are readily achievable.

#### 11 Failure to Design and Construct an Accessible Facility

12 22. On information and belief, the Restaurant was designed or  
13 constructed (or both) after January 26, 1992—independently triggering access  
14 requirements under Title III of the ADA.

15 23. The ADA also prohibits designing and constructing facilities for first  
16 occupancy after January 26, 1993, that aren’t readily accessible to, and usable by,  
17 individuals with disabilities when it was structurally practicable to do so. 42 U.S.C.  
18 § 12183(a)(1).

19 24. Here, Norm's Restaurant violated the ADA by designing or  
20 constructing (or both) the Restaurant in a manner that was not readily accessible to  
21 the physically disabled public—including Vogel—when it was structurally  
22 practical to do so.<sup>1</sup>

#### 23 Failure to Make an Altered Facility Accessible

24 25. On information and belief, the Restaurant was modified after January  
25 26, 1992, independently triggering access requirements under the ADA.

---

26  
27  
28 <sup>1</sup> Nothing within this Complaint should be construed as an allegation that plaintiff is bringing this action as a  
private attorney general under either state or federal statutes.  
*Vogel v. Norms Restaurants, LLC, et al.*  
Plaintiff’s Complaint

1           26. The ADA also requires that facilities altered in a manner that affects  
2 (or could affect) its usability must be made readily accessible to individuals with  
3 disabilities to the maximum extent feasible. 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(2). Altering an  
4 area that contains a facility's primary function also requires adding making the  
5 paths of travel, bathrooms, telephones, and drinking fountains serving that area  
6 accessible to the maximum extent feasible. Id.

7           27. Here, Norm's Restaurant altered the Restaurant in a manner that  
8 violated the ADA and was not readily accessible to the physically disabled  
9 public—including Vogel—to the maximum extent feasible.

10                   Failure to Modify Existing Policies and Procedures

11           28. The ADA also requires reasonable modifications in policies,  
12 practices, or procedures, when necessary to afford such goods, services, facilities,  
13 or accommodations to individuals with disabilities, unless the entity can  
14 demonstrate that making such modifications would fundamentally alter their  
15 nature. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(ii).

16           29. Here, Norm's Restaurant violated the ADA by failing to make  
17 reasonable modifications in policies, practices, or procedures at the Restaurant,  
18 when these modifications were necessary to afford (and would not fundamentally  
19 alter the nature of) these goods, services, facilities, or accommodations.

20           30. Vogel seeks all relief available under the ADA (*i.e.*, injunctive relief,  
21 attorney fees, costs, legal expense) for these aforementioned violations. 42 U.S.C.  
22 § 12205.

23           31. Vogel also seeks a finding from this Court (*i.e.*, declaratory relief) that  
24 Norm's Restaurant violated the ADA in order to pursue damages under California's  
25 Unruh Civil Rights Act or Disabled Persons Act.

VII. SECOND CLAIM

**Disabled Persons Act**

32. Vogel incorporates the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 30 for this claim.

33. California Civil Code § 54 states, in part, that: Individuals with disabilities have the same right as the general public to the full and free use of the streets, sidewalks, walkways, public buildings and facilities, and other public places.

34. California Civil Code § 54.1 also states, in part, that: Individuals with disabilities shall be entitled to full and equal access to accommodations, facilities, telephone facilities, places of public accommodation, and other places to which the general public is invited.

35. Both sections specifically incorporate (by reference) an individual's rights under the ADA. See Civil Code §§ 54(c) and 54.1(d).

36. Here, Norm's Restaurant discriminated against the physically disabled public—including Vogel—by denying them full and equal access to the Restaurant. Norm's Restaurant also violated Vogel's rights under the ADA, and, therefore, infringed upon or violated (or both) Vogel's rights under the Disabled Persons Act.

37. For each offense of the Disabled Persons Act, Vogel seeks actual damages (both general and special damages), statutory minimum damages of one thousand dollars (\$1,000), declaratory relief, and any other remedy available under California Civil Code § 54.3.

38. He also seeks to enjoin Norm's Restaurant from violating the Disabled Persons Act (and ADA) under California Civil Code § 55, and to recover reasonable attorneys' fees and incurred under California Civil Code §§ 54.3 and 55.



VIII. THIRD CLAIM

**Unruh Civil Rights Act**

39. Vogel incorporates the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 30 for this claim.

40. California Civil Code § 51 states, in part, that: All persons within the jurisdiction of this state are entitled to the full and equal accommodations, advantages, facilities, privileges, or services in all business establishments of every kind whatsoever.

41. California Civil Code § 51.5 also states, in part, that: No business establishment of any kind whatsoever shall discriminate against any person in this state because of the disability of the person.

42. California Civil Code § 51(f) specifically incorporates (by reference) an individual's rights under the ADA into the Unruh Act.

43. Norm's Restaurant's aforementioned acts and omissions denied the physically disabled public—including Vogel—full and equal accommodations, advantages, facilities, privileges and services in a business establishment (because of their physical disability).

44. These acts and omissions (including the ones that violate the ADA) denied, aided or incited a denial, or discriminated against Vogel by violating the Unruh Act.

45. Vogel was damaged by Norm's Restaurant's wrongful conduct, and seeks statutory minimum damages of four thousand dollars (\$4,000) for each offense.

46. Vogel also seeks to enjoin Norm's Restaurant from violating the Unruh Act (and ADA), and recover reasonable attorneys' fees and costs incurred under California Civil Code § 52(a).

IX. FOURTH CLAIM

**Denial of Full and Equal Access to Public Facilities**

47. Vogel incorporates the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 13 for this claim.

48. Health and Safety Code § 19955(a) states, in part, that: California public accommodations or facilities (built with private funds) shall adhere to the provisions of Government Code § 4450.

49. Health and Safety Code § 19959 states, in part, that: Every existing (non-exempt) public accommodation constructed prior to July 1, 1970, which is altered or structurally repaired, is required to comply with this chapter.

50. Vogel alleges the Restaurant is a public accommodation constructed, altered, or repaired in a manner that violates Part 5.5 of the Health and Safety Code or Government Code § 4450 (or both), and that the Restaurant was not exempt under Health and Safety Code § 19956.

51. Norm's Restaurant's non-compliance with these requirements at the Restaurant aggrieved (or potentially aggrieved) Vogel and other persons with physical disabilities. Accordingly, he seeks injunctive relief and attorney fees pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 19953.

X. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Vogel prays judgment against Norm's Restaurant for:

1. Injunctive relief, preventive relief, or any other relief the Court deems proper.
2. Declaratory relief that Norm's Restaurant violated the ADA for the purposes of Unruh Act or Disabled Persons Act damages.
3. Statutory minimum damages under either sections 52(a) or 54.3(a) of the California Civil Code (but not both) according to proof.
4. Attorneys' fees, litigation expenses, and costs of suit.<sup>2</sup>
5. Interest at the legal rate from the date of the filing of this action.

DATED: December 10, 2015    DISABLED ADVOCACY GROUP, APLC

/s/ Scottlynn J Hubbard IV

SCOTTLYNN J HUBBARD IV  
Attorney for Plaintiff

---

<sup>2</sup> This includes attorneys' fees under California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.  
*Vogel v. Norms Restaurants, LLC, et al.*  
Plaintiff's Complaint